DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 840 EA 014 670

AUTHOR McCareins, Alicia; And Others
TITLE An Exploratory Study of the Federal Impact on Principals. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Chicago Associates for Social Research, IL.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Oct 81
NOTE 73p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Responsibility; *Administrator Role; Annotated Bibliographies; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Government; *Federal Programs; *Federal Regulation; *Government School Relationship; Interviews; Job Satisfaction; *Principals; *Responses; Surveys; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS Illinois (Chicago)

ABSTRACT

The results of a survey, comments on the results, and an annotated bibliography are presented in this preliminary study of the impact of federal programs, mandates, and regulations on school principals. The survey involved interviewing 20 principals in urban, suburban, and small-town elementary and secondary schools in the Chicago area about federal programs' impact on their jobs and their reactions to this impact. The results indicated federal programs increased the principalship's complexity, by increasing the responsibility and pressure to conform to others' priorities without increasing power, authority, or staff resources; by decreasing autonomy; and by giving principals a sense of surveillance by a distant national government. Principals became in response either "affirmers" of the programs' worth, "ventilators" who expressed distress, "irritated" principals who were far more negative, or "presumably unaffected" principals who experienced less impact. The survey report includes a copy of the interview schedule. Comments on the survey and the research problem are by Dan C. Lortie, Van Cleve Morris, Hannah Meara, and Bruce R. Thomas. The annotated bibliography covers seven topics, including principal response to federal regulations, program implementation, legal issues, and principal job satisfaction. (Author/RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Chicago Associates for Social Research

ED219840

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE FEDERAL IMPACT ON PRINCIPALS

Final Report to the
National Institute of Education

(Contract P-80-0111)

October 1981

EA 014 670

410 S. Michigan Avenue, Suite 525 Chicago, Illinois 60605-1493 (312) 663-9365

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE FEDERAL IMPACT ON PRINCIPALS

FINAL REPORT

This exploratory study was commissioned by the National Institute of Education for the following purposes:

> To assist in planning further research in this area...To review what has already been written on the subject, to carry out initial interviews and observations with principals in a range of schools, and to consult with knowledgeable researchers, all for the purpose of making NIE aware of gaps in current knowledge and how they might best be filled through further research (NIE RFQ July 1980, p. 4).

Further, this exploratory study has arisen out of a particular context described in the RFQ:

> Observers have repeatedly suggested that there are severe impacts on principals of Federal program requirements, legal mandates, and general regulations. Some say that the impacts are out of proportion to the value of funds involved in programs, or out of proportion in re-directing educators' attention from key matters at hand in local schools which could benefit children more.

It has been our purpose to explore the nature of the Federal impact on members of a diverse sample of school principals in the Chicago metropolitan area.

The authors are grateful to Fritz Mulhauser and to other staff of the National Institute of Education for the opportunity to engage in this research. Interviews were done by Alicia McCareins, Hannah Meara, Judith Pollock, and Bruce Thomas. Pollock's and Thomas's insights contributed to this analysis as did the comments of consultants Bernard Beck, McNair Grant, Dan Lortie, and Van Cleve Morris. We also thank the principals who generously gave us some of their precious time to ask questions and become introduced to the Federal impact upon their work.

THE FEDERAL IMPACT ON SCHOOL PRINCIPALS:
An Exploratory Study

Alicia McCareins, Hannah Meara and Marilyn S. Notkin
Chicago Associates for Social Research

Introduction

Since the entrance of the Federal government into local school systems, a vast array of Federally funded programs, regulations and mandates have become part of the work life of many school principals. This study explored the Federal impact on the jobs of school principals and the ways in which Federal programs, mandates and regulations are liabilities and opportunities for them. In so doing we learned something about the nature of the Federal presence from the viewpoints of principals of local schools and its place in the context of other changes that have affected principals in the same time period.

A diverse sample of principals was drawn from urban (ten), suburban (six) and small town (four) schools in and around Chicago. The principals varied in gender (14 males; 6 females), race and ethnic background (14 white, 5 black, 1 Hispanic) as well as in job experience. Nine were principals of high schools, one of a junior high and ten of elementary schools.

The data were gathered primarily through focused interviews with individual principals.* Three principals were also observed in the course of their work for one day each. The small and exploratory nature of this study made it necessary for us to make greater use of the more efficient focused interviews over more time-consuming observations.**

---

* A copy of the interview guide is appended to this paper.

** One of the purposes of this project was to explore the value of participant observation for the study of this topic. We do so by considering the efficiency and benefits of observation and of focused interviewing in this exploratory study.

Focused interviews were a very efficient method of obtaining information

The response to the Federal impact was as varied as the sample; no principal found the impact to be totally benign and some found it to be downright intrusive and negative. Principals whose schools receive substantial Federal government funding were more likely than those with fewer programs to characterize the Federal presence in local schools in a positive manner and to be less negative than the others about ways in which it

---

about the principals' perspectives on the Federal impact. The hour-long interviews gave a full picture of each principal's perspectives and, furthermore, most of the interview was devoted to the focal topic of the research. A single interview limits the data to thoughts which occur to a principal at a particular time. In a more major study repeated interviews over the course of a year would help to broaden the topical data which could be obtained. The initial interview would sensitize principals to the issue of the Federal impact and make them better observers and reporters of its effects in subsequent interviews.

A further limitation of interviewing, however, is that data gathered are only what principals are able to report. Asked his opinion on the relative value of interviews and observations for such a study, one black urban high school principal said:

> A lot of what you do is unconscious. When you don't intend to take credit for doing something, you often don't remember it.

Principals are self-conscious about their work for they know that it will be evaluated by district administrators. They "remember" to "report" to themselves, others in the school system, and researchers certain aspects of what they do; they "forget" other aspects which they do not consider important in the scheme of self and system evaluation. We had observed actions for which the above principal did not intend to take credit and did not describe in his interview but which in our opinion and his make the school run smoothly. It is those observable actions which principals assume are unimportant and don't remember to report which are missed in a study which does not include participant observation.

Interviews then, by themselves, give an incomplete impression. They only include data which the principals have observed about themselves and are willing and able to verbalize. A topic which arouses anger in some principals, as does the topic of the Federal impact of their work, might be more fully studied with a combination of observations and interviews to achieve a more balanced picture about the work of those who use the interviews to gather together and to ventilate all the negatives about the impact. Observations too give an incomplete impression and need to be augmented by interviews, for much of the Federal impact is felt in "night work," that is, paper work taken home.

affected their work. This relationship between the level of Federal funding and reaction to it that our data suggest was found across the following characteristics of the schools: location, size of district, size of school, grades included in the school.

Most principals we contacted were willing to find time in their busy work days for an interview on the Federal impact on their work. As one who thought our study had evaluative potential said:

> I'm personally gratified to see that people are interested in knowing what's happening to the money they are spending, and I think it's long overdue. The Federal government invests such massive amounts of money into its programs, they ought to be doing follow-up to see if it's being used properly.

Another principal felt the study could be revealing "to those who produce and decide on the forms" about the problems encountered by school principals and staff who receive Federal funding:

> I think that the study as related to this purpose is quite timely and should have been done some time ago...it should be something that's on-going. The regulations continue to pile up and at the same time our staffing continues to be reduced. Our resources are reduced.

Those few who declined to be interviewed did so because of the press of their work.

A principal who values the Federal programs in his school believed our study would be worthwhile if it did not overemphasize principals' problems with paperwork. For, as the principal described at length, the paperwork and the funding are inseparable:

> Yes, it's a lot of work, yes, it's a lot of extra activity, but you can't run any kind of program without careful documentation. And documentation takes paperwork and paperwork is a necessary evil. If the respondents see the paperwork as a barrier to effectiveness, then I think the purpose of the research will miscarry...I hope it would not come out with these kinds of results, that there is too much paperwork, too much detailed introspection in Federal programs, and so we just as soon not be bothered with them. If that's going to happen, it will be counterproductive.

While some principals we interviewed felt this way, many did not, and it is the wide range of principals' reactions to the Federal impact that we explore in this paper.

Our findings are of two kinds. First, we learned from the principals the various ways in which the Federal impact contributes to the increasingly complex nature of the schools they manage. Second, we observed that principals differed from one another in their styles of reaction to the Federal impact. We report each of these findings in turn.

The Nature of the Federal Impact: Principals' Perspectives

Researchers have described how Federal programs complicate the job of principal and the running of schools (Becker, et al, 1970; Berman, 1977; Glasman, 1978-80; Hill, 1980). While our findings are congruent with those of previous researchers, they also support a change in emphasis. Most of the principals we interviewed find that Federal programs, legal mandates, and general regulations provide essential support for their philosophies of education and of service to children. In important ways the Federal impact reinforces principals in their attainment of goals they esteem. Almost all the principals we interviewed stated that they believed the concepts on which the programs are based are valid and worthwhile. The much acclaimed negative impact on principals has to do, not with the programs and regulations themselves, but, we find, with the manner of their implementation. For the manner of implementation complicates their workday and appears, to a degree, almost to subvert the objectives.

The principals we interviewed said that Federal programs had contributed to the complexity of the principalship in the following ways:

1. Principals' responsibility had increased without a commensurate increase in power and authority.
2. Principals had to discharge this responsibility without sufficient staff resources.
3. Principals experienced a decrease in their autonomy and an increase in a requirement to conform to others' rather than their own priorities.
4. Principals worked with the sense of distant surveillance by and accountability to a powerful national government.

Some of our findings in each of the aforementioned areas of impact follow.

Increased Responsibility with Insufficient Power and Authority

All principals expressed concern with the increase in their responsibilities without an increase in power and authority. Past researchers (Becker, et al, 1970) concur. Glasman (1978-80) examined how the traditional role of school administrators as evaluators has shifted with the emergence of governmental mandates. His interviews with school administrators, like those with principals in our study, revealed that they consider their responsibilities to gather information had increased while their authority to act on the information had decreased. Lorti's research on principals (1975) has a similar conclusion. He depicts principals as:

> people who must manage complex enterprises without extensive powers...(who) must make many small decisions affecting the social life within the school...(and whose) responsibilities outrun (their) authority.

An example of this impact of Federal mandates comes from a white principal in an urban high school who talks of his lack of participation in budget decisions affecting his school:

> Money for my school is channeled directly to the Central Office so that I do not have a voice in the way the money is to be spent. My school is budgeted for six million. I have a voice in $30,000 and this money is for books and supplies. In other words, of an entire school budget for a year, I have nothing to say about how it is spent in my school.

An urban female elementary principal echoes this position in her description of the principal's role as "manager of a complex organization who has the responsibility without the authority and without the extension of power."

Examining administrative as well as financial burdens placed on local education administrators, Hill (1980) found that the burden of planning and negotiation is very high in some programs (for example, Public Law 94-142) and small in others (for example, Title IX). He found that all Federal educational programs require special arrangements for planning and administration while none provides resources for its integration with other programs. One outcome of this situation is that it creates ambiguities regarding individual children's entitlement to services.

Increased Responsibility Without Staff Resources

As with any school program, Federal programs cannot be implemented without the use of staff time and supplies. Most principals we interviewed reported working longer hours than is expected of them in order to complete their administrative work. After-school meetings are routinely viewed as part of the job.

Many of the principals we interviewed felt that the administrative aspect of their job was the most time consuming and frustrating. Because city schools are in a financial crisis and have been forced to cut back personnel, principals are particularly hard hit at this time. Many of the cutbacks have occurred among administrative staff, from assistant principals to clerks, requiring the already overburdened remaining staff to take on even more responsibilities. Most principals take this work requirement in stride, as in the instance of principals who work without salary over the summer months to keep up with the demands of the job. As one urban black high school principal described:

> We usually come in during the summer, when we're not paid and we update the inventory. My administrative assistant and one or two of the clerks. Usually department chairpersons don't mind coming in. I don't get paid for any of the summer, but it is in my best interest to be here. If I'm not, it's all here waiting for me when I get back and I can never catch up. Even now I am working all day Saturday...12 hours a day...that's just something you have to do.

Another black principal, from a large high school in a rural area, places such value on the programs that the attendant work seems almost irrelevant.

> I have no choice but to be honest and candid with you. On the basis of my experience, Federal programs are not so cumbersome that one would not attempt to keep the benefits of the program in perspective to the amount of necessary forms to fill out.

Nevertheless, this same principal, along with others, reports working twelve-hour days, weekends and during the unpaid summer months. A white male from a rural elementary school said, "I have much more invisible work to do as a result of the Federal programs," and another said with resignation, "I have often come in on Sunday just to do paperwork. I never really catch up."

The use of personal time for administrative work does not always tip the scale in favor of principals having the time to interact with staff and students during the school day. One secondary school principal described this problem in the following way:

> The first year and a half I was here, I averaged one to two hours a day walking the building. I am now down to fifteen minutes to half an hour maximum every day. Part of that is because of fewer teachers, but the amount of paperwork, all the serious problems confronting the schools, the amount of paperwork is growing.

Several principals talked about attending evening meetings that are often expected of principals. In a rare instance, the administrative work had become the sole accomplishment of one black female urban elementary school principal. She said:

> The demands of making sure teachers are in their right position, that all programs are open, that all the time lines are met with special education...that the CETA people have their assignments, make it difficult to get the educational program going. All I have done since September is fool with government funding and I think that this is what has brought about the deterioration of education in the ghetto.

(This principal's experience had changed two months later when we returned for a day's observation at her school. We observed her spending much time interacting both with students and teachers in the solution of problems and planning for the future. During the course of the one day observation period, she spent one hour on work which was specifically related to a Federal program.)

Another problem principals face is having the responsibility for implementing Federal programs without the kind of monetary support for staffing that would allow them to run smoothly. This common feeling was expressed by a black female principal serving an urban elementary school.

> Everybody is perfectly willing for us to have that kind of responsibility, but they are not giving us the wherewithal to do it with. You are strictly on your own. It's not the regulations, it's the wherewithal to implement the regulations. Wherever this overhead is, I can't draw on it.

Several share the difficulty of wanting to be caring and responsible for children entrusted to them yet feeling ill-equipped to deal with the situation.

The school breakfast program, as an example, creates ambiguities and problems in implementation because of insufficient funding. An elementary school principal in an urban setting spoke to this issue:

> The Federal government provides us with the money to give them free meals but they don't give me any money to provide security people to watch them. They say run the program and they give you the books, they give you the food, they give you the equipment but they don't give you adequate support so that you can conduct it properly within the building. I go through hell just finding people to supervise those kids in the breakfast program in the morning.

The structure of certain programs unwittingly contributes to its complexities and draws upon the innovativeness of principals to implement them successfully.

A difficult dilemma faced by principals in need of Federal funds is getting the funds in the first place. Some schools go without government money if the required time and personnel to apply for them is unavailable. As one principal said:

> In order to qualify for any of these funds that come on through the government you have to know what is going on and many principals are so bogged down with the minutia of running the school, a variety of kinds of paperwork that may or may not be useful to the school in terms of providing better education, that if you don't know about the money, if you don't know how to apply for it, you never get it. I hate the massive amount of work that's involved but it doesn't scare me because I've been through it before. Most principals just aren't going to be bothered with it, even if they understand it. They are not afraid of the work that's involved, they don't have the time that's necessary, they just can't follow up.

The irony here is that administering already-obtained funds oftentimes deters principals from seeking much-needed funds for the future.

Decrease in Autonomy and Increase in Conformity to Others' Priorities

Several principals believe that a negative impact of the increased bureaucratization of schools is that they have progressively less to say about establishing educational policy and are confronted with ever-increasing constraints about these policies. Wise (1979) examined the overall results

of educational policies and decisions from all three branches of the Federal government and reached a similar conclusion. He expresses the view that the decrease in autonomy threatens local control of public education, an impact that could ultimately harm our society.

A number of principals we interviewed believe that one of the most serious consequences of Federal mandates and regulations is that they have decreased the "autonomy of principals" who "don't have the latitude and creativity" they would otherwise have if "they (the Federal government) didn't tell you what to do and how to do it." A black female principal of an urban elementary school believes that contrary to their purpose, the Federal government has the attitude that:

> Public school principals, you are dumb, you are stupid, you don't know what you are doing...we are going to send folks in to straighten you out, but you are still liable.

Several of our respondents believe Federal mandates are superceding State school codes so that schooling is slowly becoming a function of Federal rather than State legislation.

Other principals mentioned serious concern about the duplication of paperwork that is required of them for different Federal programs and regulations and for State and local programs and make it clear how they feel "run by the programs." Implementing programs that "look wonderful on paper" was described as "something else again" by one principal. Several believe that the repetition in reporting the same things to a variety of people is the "biggest problem" and one that has gotten worse in the past five years. This was expressed in the following way by one of the principals:

> When you think that you are reporting locally, that you are reporting to the State, or that you are reporting to the Feds, you are making the same report to different departments. Take special education, for example. We are doing for the district office which we did before for the downtown office, which we are going to have to do again. There ought to be a central storage where they can push a button downtown and get out anything they want. All this could be streamlined.

While they agree that documentation is justified and necessary, several others suggested a reporting system that is streamlined. They told of having

to report the same things to a variety of people, on different forms with a continual duplication of information on an endless stream of paper. (Some of this has to do with the need to report similar things to city, State and Federal sources and is not exclusively the result of Federal requirements.) Some found it arduous to complete the same lengthy form year after year: "If I could just write 'No change' on the pages which are identical from last year."

A Federally-funded program which mandates parental rights to participate in decisions about special education assignments of their children (PL 94-142) and a regulation which spells out procedures for protecting parents' access to information about their children (The Privacy Act) both set limits on principals' abilities to direct school activities in their own way.

Several principals we interviewed, referring to the Privacy Act, expressed concern about parents' over-involvement in the schools. Parents were described as "looking over the shoulders of principals," and of being so involved in school policies that they begin to believe they can make policy and determine the needs of children. One principal expressed this feeling in the following way:

> The direction of working with parents has changed, so that instead of talking with parents about their children's progress or behavior in school, we now talk about politics and proceedings. Parents used to reinforce what we did, but that's not true now...

The principle which the Privacy Act defends is one in which the principals also believe. The law supports their own goals but the procedures for its implementation make for, in their view, a great deal of unnecessary work.

Public Law 94-142 also supports programs which principals value. But its procedures on occasion subvert their efforts to achieve its goals. They feel that in many instances children are inappropriately placed because parents have too much power in the placement decision, and are swayed by personal views toward the implications of special placement for their children. Some principals were opposed to the provision in the law that, as one said, "allows parents to determine the educational needs of special education children when they are not equipped to do so." The complexities of this

situation invariably force some principals to make decisions that often are not, in their view, in the best interests of the children in order to avoid legal entanglements with some parents.

Distant Surveillance by and Accountability to a Powerful National Government

One over-riding concern among all principals is the sense of being under constant surveillance by various segments of the government and having insufficient control over the circumstances of who visits them and under what conditions. The programs generated by the Federal government are placed in schools to benefit children who are disadvantaged in one way or another, and in that sense are benign and kindly. The regulations and sanctions which accompany the beneficient stance and which are there to insure compliance, bring an additional factor of risk and threat to the principal's job.

Several principals we interviewed felt that there was little recognition of their legal status as principals although the increasing bureaucratization of schools and legislation surrounding their duties apply to them and increasingly affect them. Some Federal regulations such as due process, civil rights, sex discrimination and student records pose more problems than do others. The literature is replete with legal advice for principals (Ackerly and Gluckman, 1976; Goldsmith , 1979; King, 1979; McCrosky and Duff, 1975; and Nolte,1974). Principals' professional organizations are also devoted to helping them deal with those matters. The legal issue is an unwelcome but necessary part of the principal's job. It is a link to government that most principals prefer not to have.

Several principals expressed distress that the Federal government was linking compliance with mandates and regulations to funding for unrelated programs. They feel this threat of non-support is counterproductive and contributes to a deterioration in the relationship between principals and the government. This view was expressed by a white male principal in an urban high school:

> One of the things that I'm always a little leery about is the manner in which the money is spent. When the Federal government first began getting in education, it really was back at the sputnik time with initial involvement in NDEA, where we had to bring the schools into a par with Russia so we could get our own satellite up, in the sky. The

> government at that time was saying, we're just trying to help you. We want to improve the quality of schools. At that time everyone was saying, well, if we get Federal money aren't we also going to get Federal regulations, more and more mandates that we have to do this and that? I agree totally in principle with the fact that if anyone spends money they have to have some kind of auditing control. Is the money being used for the purposes it's supposed to be used? What upsets me is that now the Federal government is going off is a new direction. If you don't do these things, which are totally unconnected with the money that the Federal government is providing, we will cut off money for another area. So, if you do not do massive amounts of work, provide us with massive amounts of information about this or that aspect of your attendance, we will not give you any money for your science program. The two are totally unrelated. They are using the money from educational programs as a club to get information that has nothing to do with education.

Two specific examples of problems related to complying with mandates are those concerning integration and privacy. Some principals were frustrated with the paperwork, but more often with the complexities of the mandate on school (and more recently individual classroom) integration.

The principal quoted above was quite vocal about his problems with the means by which otherwise worthy Federal mandates are implemented locally. His large high school meets Federal guidelines for racial integration. When interviewed in the midst of the first term, he was disturbed at a recent request from the central administrative office that he examine the racial breakdown of each individual classroom and write explanations for the presence of any class that does not have the same proportional balance as the total school. While most classrooms were balanced appropriately, some 130 were not. He anticipates that he will spend 200 hours to comply with this request and is exasperated by the idea of having to explain why a black studies class did not have more white students. Further, he is concerned that the request will be followed by a directive to reassign students to achieve the proper proportional breakdown in each of the 700 classrooms. More than the heavy administrative burden of such a directive, he is concerned about the disservice to the students in making them "start all over for the second half of the year with a strange, new teacher" and the disservice to teachers who "have to now learn the capabilities and the diagnostic

tests for these (new) kids and so on." He is further disturbed because he has one of the few totally integrated high schools in the city yet because some of the classes are not integrated, his school is now viewed as segregated.

Most principals we interviewed agree with the premise of the Privacy Act because it is designed to protect the rights of parents and children. The legal ramifications of failing to protect records is a concern of many, however, for they see it as one other means of possibly being sued. Parental concern about privacy, in itself, adds a "small percentage" to a principal's workday.

Not all principals expressed concern about this area. Those who did, worry about lawsuits. They feel increasingly accountable for things they do, say or write. Two areas that have become targets for lawsuits by parents are those of "due process" and civil rights. "There are money damages and I think that's wrong!" was the view of one principal. Others feel their effectiveness is hampered by the continuing fear of lawsuits. One female principal of an urban elementary school, who is currently being sued, is opposed to the position of the Office of Civil Rights requiring her to make the proceedings top priority. But the Office, she notes, is not willing to give her the information she requires to respond to the suit.

Some principals believe that "continuous communication" and more direct contact between principals and those responsible for Federal programs and requirements would be beneficial. Urban principals deal through the Central Office for Federal programs and do not have direct contact with Federal Program staff. Some suburban and rural school principals have more direct contact. As one principal expressed it, "If you understand the rationale for a form or report, it becomes easier (to do it)."

Commenting on reports, principals said things like, "Who reads them?" "What do they do with the information?" Principals feel "a certain sense of futility about generating detailed information and sending if off when there (is) never any feedback from it." They wonder "if the process would be more accessible if a mechanism could be devised wherein there was some feedback."

School Principals: Styles of Reaction to the Federal Impact

Our brief encounters with twenty-one principals give the impression that there are several kinds of reactions to Federal programs and regulations: the Affirmers, the Ventilators, the Irritated and the Presumably Unaffected.

The Affirmers

One-third of our sample are Affirmers. They invite respect because of the high level of their investment in the quality of education for children and in estimable goals, in this case the goals of Federal programs and regulations. They undertake their work with a sense of equanimity, competence, and excellent management skills. Beyond their common response to the Federal impact, there is little similarity between these principals. They work at elementary, junior high and high schools in urban, suburban and rural areas. They are black, white and Hispanic, male and female, and vary in length of time in the principalship.

Here are two examples of the ways in which principals express their commitment to educational quality and Federal program goals. The first is a Hispanic female principal of an urban elementary school. Although she is not fond of bureaucratic red tape, her predominant approach to description of the Federal impact is to phrase it in terms of its benefits:

> As long as it has a positive impact on my children, I will find the time and resources to aid in complying with the demands, some of which I believe are useless and indicate either a lack of concern for the principalship or a good deal of naivete about the demands of the job. I have weighed both the pros and cons of the Federal forms and have concluded that for my school the benefits outweigh the costs. I look at the forms as unnecessary means to a valuable end.

She views the bothersome aspects of Federally funded programs with a measure of equanimity. This impression was sustained and amplified by a day of observation of this principal and her school. Her day was devoted to the children and the teachers. She gives the impression of a powerful person who manages her urban elementary school very effectively. Other than spending

some time supervising the Federally funded school lunch program, she spent no time on matters related to Federal programs or regulations saving all paperwork to work on later at home.

A black male high school principal in a relatively economically depressed area of towns that have both suburban and rural aspects talked at length about the positive meaning to him of Federal programs and regulations. He clearly identifies with the goals of the programs, an approach which is evident as he talks about Title One:

> Title One provides remedial services to the kids who have been identified as having an educational handicap of some sort, whether it's because of the lack of experiences at home where the parents don't talk to the kids, don't read to the kids, don't travel. It's, in more instances than not, a cultural phenomenon associated with socio-economic strata. And when we identify these kids who have the potential, the academic potential to be at grade level or above, but who are not achieving then we provide the Title One services which are supplemental to what they would ordinarily receive. And, we've had great successes with the Title One students. We're proud of that.

Title One fits within the context of his most important goal for educating the students at his school:

> I'm happy to say that we are about to do some changing in terms of expectations with the kids and the staff. And even the parents, we've raised their levels of expectations. I'm attempting to communicate to them that they can make their lives better if they're capable of competing in a very difficult world. And the only way they can compete is to have the skills, tools, social skills...And we're getting support from the program.

He uses the program as he uses all other resources to build up the quality of educational achievement of students in his school.

The strings attached to Federally funded programs do not cause him distress as his discussion of Public Law 94-142 shows:

> It is cumbersome because of the rules and regulations associated with 94-142 but by the same token, it's beneficial because it provides money to provide services that were not historically available to school districts. A lot of times people bitch about the necessity of doing certain kinds of paperwork. If they went out and did it it would take less time than grumbling about it. People who may have

> complaints about the Federal government requirements in terms of reports and being audited and checked on, which they should be if they're using Federal money, they'd be moanin' and groanin' if the government withdrew the programs.

He gives the impression of wasting no time at all with moaning and groaning.

Effective planning and implementation skills are evident in the approaches of "Affirming" principals to their work. A black male principal of a large urban high school expresses this capability.

> The point is to have a plan. If you can get ninety to one hundred percent of that plan, you can make a success. I don't expect the Federal government to come up with a perfect plan, but they do have a plan. I can't make recommendations about the plan because I didn't start out with the initial concept. But given that there was some intelligence involved, then if I follow that plan, I can meet with the successes that the plan was designed to assist me in attaining. So I can live with that.

This man keeps the goals of the program in mind while working within its associated constraints. He makes the good will assumption that prescribed work plans result in prescribed ends and, because the goals are his too, they do.

During the day in which we observed this principal at work, he attended a meeting of all principals in the city called to introduce them to a change in management of some data which all principals gather. Confirming the observer's opinion, he said:

> You notice how many of them are complaining? It is beyond me why they are going to make these simple changes affect them and their whole personnel staff. But they are. It is going to happen anyway. I'm sure you saw this kind of thing from other principal's you talked with. I find that pulling your hair out won't solve a thing, so I am going to do the best I can to understand what they want and (find) the easiest way to implement it.

He took along to the meeting a staff person who would be involved in implementing the new system for, as he said: "Two heads are better than one... Between the two, it should not be too difficult."

This particular observation gave a splendid opportunity for us to observe reaction styles of a large number of principals to a single event which has much in common with the sort of events which are part of Federal programs and regulations. While principals around him reacted in terms of

other styles, this principal reacted just as he had earlier described in an interview.

Another urban high school principal, a white male, anticipates Federal mandates and prepares for them ahead of time. Title IX presented him with no problems despite loud and persistent complaints by the boys in this school which is exceptionally successful in city-wide male sports competitions, for he started the process of integrating the physical education program a full year before it was required. This year gave him an opportunity, as he says, "to know what we were doing" and to deal with complaints by students and parents so that when the change was legally mandated he could achieve it with no problem.

Another high school principal, a white male in Chicago, describes his techniques for dealing with the large amount of paperwork he takes home on nights and weekends. Referring to some forms, he said:

> I use these, it helps clear the stuff out in a hurry because there are standard responses to many of these things. I just put these on. I have different forms depending upon where it goes, how it's going to be used, how it's going to be distributed. (Interviewer: You made these up yourself?) (Nods, indicating that he did.) And I staple it on or clip it on and then it goes out. But in so many cases, it's to say to my secretary or through the forms: See me at such and such a time.

He is organized in many aspects of his work, apparently, for behind his desk on a bulletin board is an organizing scheme for projects with deadlines. These elements of management capability are not exclusively the province of Affirmers, however, for the Ventilators and some others share many of these qualities.

The Ventilators

Ventilators, making up almost forty percent of this sample, do their job with much the same competence and sense of the goals of programs and regulations as do the Affirmers but with much more expression of distress about the negative aspects of the Federal impact. We got their title name from the following statement by a black, female principal of an urban elementary school:

> I'm old enough in the business to have a gyroscope and that's keeping me on an even keel. I don't let any of these things affect my attitude toward my job, even this matter of the restrictions placed on me by the Central Office. I give them what they want and then...I do what I think should be done. They know exactly how I feel about everything. What it does for me is give me an opportunity to ventilate so I can go right on ahead.

Giving an impression of competence and dedication throughout the interview, this principal, nevertheless, expressed extreme annoyance and irritation about the duplication of effort and her perceived lack of control over the programs for which she was responsible.

Another principal, a white female in an urban high school, expressed exasperation throughtout her descriptions of the Federal impact on her school and on her work. She said, for example:

> When you get to Federal regulations. Yes, we've had a snowstorm of Federal regulations. We've coped. (She laughs). Actually, many of them are right and should be done...For example, the right to privacy or the right to examine records. It's never been any problem, ever. The parent wants to see his child's records. Fine. But now there's a PRO-CEDURE: so many days for this, and so many days for that...And I just skip the procedure to cut down...Follow the law without getting bogged down. And the parent is also bogged down because they have to make application in writing and do this and do that. It's much nicer when they come and say, 'I'd like to examine Johnnie's folder.' Great. Have it out right there...That they should apply in writing. I should respond in writing. Why, when you can talk face to face?

We have the impression that this principal uses much the same discretion in her implementation of Federal programs and regulations as the Affirmers. She seemed quite affirming in her dedication to the effective achievement of the goals of programs and policies but, at the same time, she continuously complained about the related headaches.

The Irritated

Unlike the Affirmers and the Ventilators, the two principals (11% of the sample) with the style, The Irritated, were far more negative in their description of the Federal impact. A black, urban, female elementary school principal described herself as highly stressed, saying: "Most principals go crazy at the mention of government funding." She described the programs

in negative terms and saw no benefits accruing from them. "I would give my right arm if I could get rid of government funds and go back to basic schooling." Some of her complaints were:

> I believe government funds, contrary to their purpose, supplant rather than support local effort...They define the local school rather than the local school defining the support...this causes rivalry and power struggles and raises questions about who's running the ship.

She believed there has been deterioration of the quality of education which is further exacerbated because:

> We have convinced teachers that they cannot work with poverty-level youngsters unless they have a teacher's aide, or a field worker coming to confer with them, or leave the building and go out for an in-service, or have staff development.

This principal's preoccupation with the negatives seemed to have an effect on her perception of her effectiveness on the job.

A white, male suburban high school principal also responded to the Federal impact in predominantly negative terms. The interviewer describes him as follows:

> ...used words such as repugnant, ridiculous to describe the way he feels about Federal forms. He spent most of the time talking about the forms themselves, not the programs, because he said: 'I have very little to do with them. They go directly to Central Office.' ...he treats most Federal forms "with aversion and disdain.' and believes many of his principal colleagues feel the same way. Active in other professional organizations in the State, he and others, he said, 'wonder what happens later?' to all the paper and forms. What's ridiculous, he said, are some of the 'picky' things in the regulations--like compliance deadlines and 'how many toilets there are' because they do not have anything to do with the standards they already have at the local level.

While he sees benefits in some Federal programs, when program requirements do not meet his needs he does not express the understanding, as do others, that they may be necessary in other contexts or in other places.

The Presumably Unaffected

Some principals, making up seventeen percent of our sample, feel that there is little Federal impact on their work because they have few Federal programs, or because Federal programs are administered at a higher level.

We use the word "presumably" because, strong though their assertion to the contrary, we assume that they are as subject to Federal mandates and regulations as are any principals. In particular, they assert that Federal programs had little impact on their work because most of the administrative work involved in obtaining funds or writing proposals is done at the district level.

Two white, male elementary school principals, both in suburban areas, disclaimed much Federal impact on their work. One principal talked of experiencing an increase in time working with parents and with students on discipline, not as a consequence of Federal programs but of his becoming a principal. The only impact of Federal programs brought to light in the interview is a slight increase in paperwork related to the school lunch program. The other heralded local autonomy, saying: "Each principal is kind of the head of his school. We run our own show here."

A white, male principal of an urban magnet elementary school told the interviewer that he had little to discuss about Federal impact since there were no Federally funded programs in his school and minimal paperwork associated with his job. An officer of a principal's association, he was acquainted with the problems of Federally funded programs but had no problems himself with them. Shortly thereafter, he continued by saying, "Although I have no problem with such programs, I am bothered by the tremendous problems concerning Federal rules and regulations regarding handicapped children in my school."

Further probing revealed that this program is "disruptive, too demanding of everyone's time" and at times, results in school personnel "spending more time administering this program than working with the majority of ordinary children." In our view his whole school is a result of Federal impact, for it was designed to achieve voluntary racial integration for compliance with Federal mandates. He, however, like some of his suburban colleagues, prefers not to focus upon the Federal presence in his school.

Principals have different styles of reaction to Federal programs, regulations, and mandates. It would be convenient to find that each type of reaction was characteristic of principals of certain backgrounds and locations.

Such was not the case in an overall sense. There are, however, no female, black or high school principals among the Presumably Unaffected. There are no suburban principals among the Affirmers. These trends are suggestive but they are the only ones which appear.

The Principalship and the Federal Impact: Implications and Conclusions

The role of the school and, concomitantly, that of the principal has been expanded. Although principals in our study varied in our view as to their effectiveness, they all felt a sense of being critical to the quality of life in their schools. Berman (1977) found this to be the case in a survey he conducted of 171 principals on the factors affecting implementation and continuation of Federally funded programs. In a later study of the effects of Federal education programs on school principals, Hill (1980) came to similar conclusions.

Several principals in our study pointed out that schools today are being asked to fill "social gaps" far beyond education. Services which were previously provided by the community through family, church and youth organizations are now seen as the responsibility of the school. "Now," said one principal:

> many people still have the idea that the parent ought to be responsible for the child and I would agree except that the parent is not in fact responsible for the child. The child is entitled to certain therapy and that sort of thing, and it behooves society, and in this case society means the school, to provide them.

Federal programs attempt to insure that these services are available to every child who needs them.

Several of our principals expressed the view that the professional preparation of principals should include leadership role training and training for adapting to changes that routinely become part of their job. Schoeny and Ho (1980) discussed the need for training principals in

these same capacities. They concluded from their research that success of school programs depends upon the principal's ability to be an innovative organizer, manager of programs, and problem solver of the complex interrelationships implementing the program's cause. Their research findings about how principals they studied described their jobs are similar to our findings. Like us, they found that principals secure support for their schools, develop curricula and staff and mediate human relations for the school.

Most of the principals we interviewed found that the benefits to children outweigh the work that Federal programs and regulations impose. A black male principal of a Chicago high school summed up the more positive of the responses in this way:

> I think that it should be recognized that many of these regulations were designed to require, if you will, an equal kind of impact within the range of eligibility. And, therefore, accountability must be demonstrated. Ergo the paperwork. So, I have no problems in somebody coming in here to monitor what I am doing or to audit what happened to every penny or what have you. Because I know that given so much individual freedom, States' rights, local control, local autonomy and what have you, everybody's not gonna get their fair share of the pie. I don't think everybody is exactly getting their fair share of the pie now but they're getting a heck of a lot more...than they got before we got into all of this... the positives and the negatives if you want to add them up. I think on the positive side that you got a 'tower'. And on the negative side you got a 'small shot'.

Despite their often positive statements about Federal impact, even the most enthusiastic proponents of the programs and regulations acknowledge that their implementation has consequences for them and for their schools.

The main impact on school principals of Federal programs, mandates and regulations is an increase in the complexity of the organizations that principals manage. While this is a trend to which principals would be subject if there were no Federal involvement in local education, the complexity is greater than it would be without such involvement. In particular, the increase in complexity is felt as a problem because of the associated conditions which we have described in this paper: their responsibilities have

increased without a commensurate increase in their power and authority; they have had to discharge their added responsibilities without sufficient staff resources; a decrease in tneir autonomy and an increase in the requirement of conformity to others' priorities; the sense of working under surveillance by and with accountability to a powerful national government. Some principals manage these conditions with greater equanimity than do others; they exercise management skills and have an approach which encompasses the complexities without undue trauma. Others, at times, seem deeply troubled by the management requirements the federal impact requires. Still others, find themselves in situations where the federal impact is not perceived to be great or troublesome.

All in all, the Federal impact and its associated complexity is a positive condition for most of the principals we studied. These principals, each in their own schools, find in Federal programs, mandates and regulations an important kind of support, monetary and otherwise, for equity and quality in education. Because of the Federal impact, they are able to encompass within a local realm some aspects of their goals and values for which there is not always powerful local support. This very positive aspect of the Federal impact was described by many of the principals we interviewed--and it forms one important element in the overall complexity.

References

Ackerly, R.L. and Gluckman, I.B. The Reasonable Exercise of Authority, II. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1976.

Becker, Gerald, et al. Issues and Problems in Elementary School Administration. Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University, Center for Educational Research and Service, February 1970.

Berman, Paul, Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin, et al. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change Volume VII Factors Affecting Implementation and Continuation. R-1589/7-HEW Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corp., April 1977.

Glasman, N.S. The Effects of Governmental Evaluation Mandates. Administrator's Notebook, 1978-1980, 27 (2)

Goldsmith, A.H. Discipline, Discrimination, Disproportionality and Discretion: A Legal Memorandum. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, November 1979.

Hill, Paul, Joanne Wuchitech, Richard Williams. The Effects of Federal Education Programs on School Principals. N. 1467-HEW. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corp., February 1980.

King, R.A. Litigation, Legislation and the Principal. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 8-12, 1979.

Lortie, Dan C. Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

McCrosky, Cherie LeLeure and Grace Duff. Legal Aspects of Sex Discrimination in Education. Illinois Principal. May 1975.

Nolte, M. and Chester, E. School Communications: Duties and Dangers: A Legal Memorandum. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, April 1974.

Schoeny, Donna Hager and Robert Ho. The Role of the Principal in Federal Programs. Report for National Institute of Education, 1980.

Wise, A. Legislated Learning: The Bureaucratization of the American Classroom. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1979.

Interview Guide

Introduction

The Federal government through the National Institute of Education is interested in exploring the impact of Federal programs and legislation on school principals. NIE has asked us to assist them in finding out from principals themselves just what this impact is and how their jobs are affected by Federal programs. We hope you will share your experiences with us for the purpose of uncovering the issues which seem most important to you.

1. What are your initial reactions to the purpose of this study?

2. What are the names of Federal programs in your school? (See check list of programs)

3. What are the effects of Federal programs on your job? (Refer to check list of recent findings)

4. In what ways are Federal programs liabilities and opportunities for you in your job?

Chicago Associates for Social Research

Memoranda and Commentary Regarding "An Exploratory Study of the Federal Impact on Principals"

Prepared for

The National Institute of Education

by

Dan C. Lortie, Professor and Director
Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago

Van Cleve Morris, Professor of Education
College of Education, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

Hannah Meara, Director
Chicago Associates for Social Research

1981

410 S. Michigan Avenue, Suite 525 Chicago, Illinois 60605-1493 (312) 663-9365

MEMORANDUM

TO: Readers of the CASR report entitled "An Exploratory Study of the Federal Impact on Principals."

FROM: Dan C. Lortie, Professor and Director, Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago.

Changes in the political and social climate of the nation have important and pervasive effects on the formulation of policy research in education, particularly when that research deals with the actions of the Federal government. A few years ago many of us assumed that Federal support was a secure and growing factor on the educational scene and were genuinely concerned about how that support was given; we looked forward to finding better ways to use Federal funds, better ways to implement the policies which such support was intended to foster. Since the medicine was relatively abundant, we worried about the side-effects and how to control them.

Today things seem different. Many wonder now whether the future will bring such severe reductions in direct Federal support that questions of how best to organize such support may become trivial. As such support becomes increasingly scarce, a pessimistic scenario would say, its value will become so high that it will be foolish to worry about anything but the most severe side-effects. Given the losses in local and state support, one can argue, Federal funds will be absolutely essential to protect recent gains and advance those still necessary in public schools; complaints about implementation under circumstances such as these might seem downright absurd.

Yet we cannot know for sure what the future will bring and I believe it unwise to concede hope for the future by simply assuming the worst. Federal support may continue to play a significant role on the educational scene, and given a context of relative poverty for schools and other public services, that support may become more rather than less crucial. The effective use of Federal monies will then become even more vital, as more will have to be done with less. Thus issues of how best to implement Federal action in local school districts are not moot. But even if the pessimists prove to be right, we should continue to prepare for the time when the political pendulum again swings, as I think it must, in favor of human needs.

The questions addressed by the CASR research group are, in my opinion, still important and much remains to be done in finding answers to them. As I review the report, I see it as beginning an undertaking which merits considerably wider scope and greater resources in future research. The limits of the research mandate have resulted in some obvious deficiencies; for example, sample size is so constrained that one cannot generalize to any larger population or be certain about connections between the views of particular kinds of principals and their work situations. It is to the credit of the writers of the report that they show full awareness of these limitations while providing us with some leads for future research.

Perhaps one of the most interesting starting points for further research is on page six where the authors say:

> Principals whose schools receive substantial Federal government funding were more likely than those with fewer programs to characterize the Federal presence in local schools in a positive manner and to be less negative than the others about ways in which it affected their work.

Although one misses tabular detail which would make the relationship more explicit, that statement is indeed provocative, in fact, doubly so. It says that those principals who have the most experience with Federal programs support them most strenuously, a rather impressive vote. That support is even more impressive when we realize that those dealing with the largest number of programs encounter the greatest number of extra demands which accompany Federal involvement in their schools.

I said that the statement is doubly significant. Given the high probability that schools which are more heavily engaged with Federal programs are those with weaker financial bases and/or the more severely disadvantaged students, it looks as if need is correlated with a favorable view of Federal engagement in school affairs. That is hardly surprising, but having indication of its presence should inform the design of future research on principal assessments of Federal intervention. I suspect, furthermore, that at least some of the complaints heard from the more prosperous suburban officials may be put forward as justification for their lesser participation in government programs; to the extent that is true, we can discount some of the allegations made against those programs and their implementation.

My first recommendation for further research is, therefore, that the next stage of research include, as design factors, both the financial con-

dition of school districts and their degree of participation (where choice is possible) in Federal programs. The "demographics" of school officials' complaints may prove extremely valuable in assessing their seriousness.

The CASR report pays relatively little attention to the organization within which principals themselves work as subordinates--the local school district. Some of the observations imply, in fact, that one can assess the effects of Federal actions on schools without examining the role of school boards and superintendents. Now it is clear that problems of principal autonomy preceded the emergence of Federal programs by many decades; it is also clear that school districts differ in the degree and kinds of autonomy they permit principals. School districts might also be expected to differ in how central office personnel handle Federal and State requests for information and documentation. In my research, some principals praise their superiors for doing much to lessen the load of paperwork they must do where others condemn them for the opposite. (One has also heard rumors that some superintendents blame "the government" for information requests they have initiated.) It seems most likely that the stance taken by the central office is important in the experience of the principal. If a particular district develops sophisticated computer practices which simplify the work of principals by reducing duplication, etc., is this not likely to produce different attitudes toward Federal reporting requirements? If one district is relaxed and considerate about deadlines (avoiding the hated short deadline), is it not likely to engender assessments of Federal programs which differ from that which is not?

A second recommendation is that future research treat the school district as a significant unit of analysis in determining the effects of Federal practices on the work life of the principal. This recommendation matches the first which also implies that school district characteristics be taken into account in such follow-up research.

Finally, I want to turn to the problem of paperwork from the perspective of remedial action. For whatever the variations experienced by principals in diverse circumstances, it <u>is</u> clear that current Federal practices use up scarce resources of administrative energy at a time when financial cutbacks are also straining those resources. It is obvious that the receipt of Federal funds obligates the recipients to document the use of those funds, particularly when the grants are based on specific criteria. But

need we assume that current practices--in detail--are the only way in which that documentation can be handled? Are we to assume, moreover, that the local school district should carry all the burdens of time and money required to fulfill Federal requirements?

It seems to me that NIE could play a very useful role in attacking these issues. Activity could be of two kinds--research could be done and mutual consultation with local school officials undertaken. As part of the research, efforts could be made to find school districts and principals who vary in how they actually handle Federal requirements. It may be, for example, that some comply fully with Federal requirements but do so at considerably lower time and money cost than others; discovering the techniques they employ could be useful--if disseminated--to other school officials. Federal programs might differ among themselves in the number and kinds of demands they make for information; is it possible that some have found effective yet less demanding ways of monitoring their programs which could be disseminated within the government itself?

NIE need not, however, limit itself only to research as it attacks these problems. I could see value in a series of well-organized conferences across the country in which school officials, government officials and commuication experts could work together to find less costly ways to meet Federal needs while reducing the burden on school administrators. Is it conceivable that under particular circumstances, the Federal government could include resources to help receiving school districts to report on their use of Federal funds? Could pooling among school districts produce new resources (e.g., centralized computer facilities, a corps of highly skilled clerical people) which would reduce the load on any one school district or school official?

These are some suggestions which I believe might help American public schools and the education agencies work toward a fruitful cooperation in the years ahead. As I see it, the Federal government could and should employ both research and consultation approaches in tackling what remains a critical problem area within our overall network of public education.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO CIRCLE
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
BOX 4348, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60680
TELEPHONE: (312) 996-5641

June 23, 1981

Ms. Marilyn S. Notkin
Chicago Associates for Social Research
410 S. Michigan
Chicago, Illinois 60605

Dear Ms. Notkin:

Following up on my earlier note of June 1 and our meeting on the 15th, I am forwarding this commentary on the draft report so that you may include it as a part of the total file to the N.I.E.

As I commented at the meeting, I believe the general impression one gets from your report is the lingering question as to just how severe federal intrusion is. As the four types of principals are delineated late in the report, the reader could possibly draw the conclusion that most principals are able to cope and that, although there is considerable grumbling and griping, the job gets done and the federal purposes (equity, etc.) are somehow being served. If, that is, the Affirmers, the Ventilators, and the Not Involved represent a sizeable segment of the sample, then one might conclude that what is going on is a routine adjustment of administrative behavior.

Having been a dean of a college of education in a public university for seven years, I had to contend with some of the same harassments currently being visited on school principals. In my case, however, as with others in higher education, the point of the federal sword was not programmatic changes but rather personnel policy. If I had been required to participate in a similar study at that time, I am fairly sure that I would have been one of the Ventilators. Somehow the work got done, but I was not one of the Affirmers who believe that all is for the good.

This is an indirect way to get to my point, namely, that although the report indicates that coping is going on and is fairly satisfactory, the long-term damage being inflicted on school administrators may be more subtle, but perhaps even more pernicious than this report suggests. I have in mind the Chinese water torture syndrome in which seemingly insignificant annoyances, by repetition, gradually build to become life-threatening tragedies. Every new federal intrusion, with its mountain of regulations, paper work, and guideline compliance, is by itself something that almost any school administrator can deal with and adjust to. But there is no question in my mind, but that the cumulative effect of repeated sequences of this scenario does have a weakening effect on administrative resolve and managerial discipline. If so much of a manager's time must continually be diverted from regular school concerns and devoted instead to bureaucratic recordkeeping and paper shuffling, then the will to deliver a first-class educational product, as a <u>personal commitment</u>

of the principal, begins to flag. The end result is the gradual turning to these bureaucratic behaviors in order to survive, with less and less time being given to the human, person-to-person element so vital to a strong educational program.

It is true that the CASR report does not reveal much in the way of principals shortchanging their personal duties in the school environment in favor of responding to federal programs. And on a time-motion basis, I believe that finding squares with ours in the study of principals on the job. But what I am talking about is beneath the surface, a life of (in Thoreau's term) quiet desperation among principals in personally being required to forego what they consider to be the heart of education, namely, personal development of students and teachers under their jurisdiction, and instead to direct their energies to the machinery of institutional life.

I have no suggestions at the moment on how one might go about studying this more subtle effect. One might look at voluntary retirements from administrative positions, or perhaps conduct exit interviews with selected principals who are returning to the classroom or who are changing careers. But even with this method, it would be clear that a quantitative finding probably would not tell you much, so it might be necessary to turn to other procedures to verify what I am talking about.

One of my pet theories is that educational administrators are already turning away from personal concerns and a sensitive regard for the ongoing educational process, in favor of an obsession with operating the apparatus of the bureaucracy. A case in point: most principals now have at their disposal a public address system that can reach any room in the building. The mere availability of this means of communication urges its use by the principal, and one of the most intrusive episodes in any teacher's life is to have the squawk box come on in the middle of a lesson and interrupt the train of thought of the students in a room. Technology therefore provides the means of intrusion, and since it is there waiting for the principal to use, it <u>will</u> be used.

So likewise, my theory goes, equity politics has spawned hundreds of directives from Washington on how to run a school. Since these directives exist, the bureaucracy in Washington must see that they are enforced, and an army of enforcers is in place to do the work. Therefore, the existence of the directive becomes the primary criterion for its use. The directives provide the means of intrusion, and since they stand waiting in the federal documents, one can be sure that they <u>will</u> be used.

I would comment further on a tangential feature of the situation which is not developed in the report but which, because it too is a sub-cutaneous response, is worthy of some attention. I refer to the fact that a steady tattoo of federal (or other government) intrusions into the life of a school have the overall impact of exacerbating distrust of and contempt for government. Not only are the government's directives bloodless and impersonal, thus clogging the emotive, affective channels of interpersonal communication in the exciting and lively school, but these directives customarily generate material that no one, least of all the bureaucracy, ever makes use of. What are children

to think when their adult educators who surround them every day are contemptuous of the bureaucrats downtown or in Washington D.C. who demand these materials merely for the sake of demanding them? I think the nation's school children, at least at the secondary level, are gradually turning away from the tension and excitement of school work because they sense that their teachers and principals don't give a damn about it themselves. And this attitude, I think, can be traced to the fact that the bureaucratic (including federal) requirements of teaching and administering are taking over the foreground of our educational attention. My point is that all of this is not lost on youngsters.

A final point: Joe Califano, in his new book on his experiences in the federal establishment, makes the point that in our social legislation we have created hundreds of lobbies each of which now demands its piece of the pie. With interest-group politics, it is now virtually impossible to change the course of governmental action since every piece of legislation is evaluated on how it affects <u>me</u>, not on how it affects the republic. Well, we know Califano is right, but we also know, as Califano seems not to remember, that Califano was the chief architect of much of this lobby-generating legislation. If a person at the helm of social action for so many years cannot see what the problem is, is there hope for statesmanship in the future? But my point is something deeper. With every new interest group, there is also born a trigger point of protest when the interest group's special interest is being threatened. Federal legislation as it is delivered into the schools thus lays open more and more nerve endings, i.e., more and more opportunities to feel oneself put upon by the system. The school is particularly susceptible to this phenomenon since it is the one institution (with the possible exception of the I.R.S.) which touches virtually everybody. The school therefore is the ground on which equity questions are most likely to arise, and since federal programs are largely oriented to the equity dimension, these programs increase geometrically the possibilities for social discord and inter-group unrest. I think most of us are prepared to accept a large measure of this unrest as the price we pay for figuring out what is equitable. But it remains that every federal intrusion into the schools tears another rip in the social fabric, and provides the incentive for citizen turning on citizen, either in overt litigious action or in covert hostile resentment.

What I have touched on above is perhaps eminently <u>unresearchable</u>, but I think my hypotheses are plausible enough to bear some sort of consideration in the future activities of your organization, CASR.

Meanwhile, may I wish you well with the completion and submission of this report and with your other undertakings.

Sincerely,

Van Cleve Morris

Van Cleve Morris
Professor of Education

VCM:ps

The Federal Impact on Principals:
Perspectives on Future Research

Hannah Meara, Director
Chicago Associates for Social Research

We have explored the impact of Federal programs, mandates, and regulations on public school principals. Our exploration has taken two forms: (1) exploratory research, including both focused interviews and field observations, with a diverse sample of Chicago metropolitan area principals; and (2) a study of the published and some unpublished literature on the subject. Our report to NIE includes both a report of the results of our exploratory research and an annotated bibliography based upon our review of the literature. It is the purpose of this memorandum to make suggestions for further research on the subject of the Federal impact on school principals.

What have we learned about the Federal impact from other researchers? There is a small body of research which views the Federal impact on the school principals. Hill and his colleagues at the Rand Corporation (1980), did telephone interviews with fifty-five school principals in six states. They report an impressive list of changes which principals have experienced in the past five years, changes due, in part, to the Federal impact. In short, they find that the job of school principal has become a complex management task and includes increasingly more accountability to funding sources beyond the local level. Lorti's (1975) qualitative study of school principals reveals how principals must manage these more complex responsibilities without a commensurate increase in their authority. His findings are corroborated by those of Glasman (1978-80) who finds a related increase in informal efforts to obtain formally unavailable authority. Schoeny and Ho's (1980) review of a sample of NIE sponsored research on the principal's role in Federal programs find that principals need leadership skills to manage the complex tasks which result.

Principals are seen as having a major influence on the implementation and continuity of Federal programs (Berman, et al, 1977). The nature of their influence is related in part to their style of leadership (Ibid.). Studies of the principals' reactions to Federal programs and regulations offer contradictory findings, possibly an accurate representation of the world they study.

Abramowitz and Tenebaum (1978), studying high school principals, find objections to required paper work but acceptance of Federal desegregation requirements. Becker and his colleagues (1970) find that elementary school principals experience desegregation requirements as usurpment of their educational leadership functions.

Most of these studies, based on the use of survey research methodology, offer complementary results. Changes in principals' roles related to a number of historical trends including the Federal impact, have been described in terms of the variables which the surveys offer for response. Lorti's and Glasman's more qualitative research offer a more dynamic understanding of the changes in principals' roles.

In all of these studies the focus has been on principals as people who have experienced certain changes in their roles as a result of the Federal impact. What is missing in the literature, and what impressed us most in our exploratory research with a diverse sample of school principals in the greater Chicago area were the individual differences between principals in their styles of reaction to the Federal impact and sometimes similar reactions to impacts from the district and the state. We classified those we interviewed as Affirmers, Ventilators, Irritated, and Presumably Unaffected principals based on their different personal styles of reaction to the Federal impact. A consultant to our project who is a district program administrator, former principal, and long-time observer of school principals confirmed our designation of types; he recognized each one and could not think of reaction types we did not identify.

These types speak for a complex mix of what makes up human beings who are principals: personalities, general life and career histories, personal talents and acquired skills.* Beyond and surrounding these individual human beings are the social and economic contexts which grant them opportunities and limitations.

---

*The question naturally and immediately arises as to associations between these "individual differences" and other variables such as size and type of school district, number of Federal programs in the school, type of school, etc. The "informal tabulation" and the three tables attached to this memo show how we explored this issue with the data at our disposal. There is clearly more variability within each category than there is between categories. There still remains the possibility that a future, more large-scale study, will be able to find associations between background variables and style of reaction to the Federal impact.

Principals are in vertical career paths. All began as school teachers. Some have reached a career peak in the principalship, others are still on the rise. Those who are categorically in the minority in terms of power in this country cherish their present and future careers in the special way of people who could not always safely assume they would attain them. This point was brought home when one of us pressed an urban black high school principal to explain how it was that he continuously takes such a positive stance with regard to the Federal impact upon his work. He replied:

> Well I didn't exactly fall out of the sky in a suit and tie, you know. I've picked cotton. I've worked in the rice fields. I've... I'm pretty glad to be a high school principal!

Not all who cherish their career attainments in this way are Affirmers, however, for the stresses of the work fall differently upon different backs. It takes skill to manage the complex and often conflicting tasks of the principalship; tasks related to Federal programs are managed much more skillfully by some than by others. What accounts for the differences? Previous job experiences and training opportunities account for some of the differences we observed between principals who manage well and those who don't. Psychological skills and strengths may also be factors.

How to study the personal styles of reactions to the Federal impact? We would do much, much more of what we did to arrive at the styles in the first place. We would spend time with the principals, gain their confidence, engage them in a research partnership. We would absorb their histories, personal versions of on-going life events, styles of management and of interaction with the important variety of others. We would primarily listen but we would also watch--for the sake of what we would see and for the sake of convincing the principals and ourselves that we understand the context which they most directly experience. We would compile "dossiers" on a number of principals, dossiers which would include the focal topics we have introduced but which would always be directed at the aim of the investigation: how is it that these individuals have the particular styles of reaction they have to the Federal impact upon their work?

Such future research on the Federal impact on school principals would be guided in part by some of the research on their job satisfaction. Studies have focused on psychological characteristics such as individual characteristics and psychological needs (Gross and Napior, 1967) and on theories of personality (Johnson and Weiss, 1971). Studies of styles of leadership (e.g.,

Fielter, 1972 and Mishel, 1974) and of styles of decision-making (e.g., Johnson and Weiss, 1971) would also make a contribution. Results of studies of the effects of gender (e.g., Paddock, 1979) would also be used.

We would also, on behalf of the principals we interviewed, propose a second area for future research: the problematic nature of communications to principals about the administration of Federal programs, regulations, and mandates. The principals, themselves, convinced us of the importance of studies of what we think of as communication among principals and district administrators and Federal officials about Federal programs and regulations. Mediated rather than direct communication, even with district administrators, and certainly with Federal officials, about the work they must do to administer programs and to abide by regulations is a big problem to principals. In the large school systems they communicate only with district administrators and sometimes not even with their faces or voices. Much communication takes place by paper and pencil through filling out forms and these forms are often mysterious to the principals both in the intent of their creation and their use once sent back. They want researchers to study what happens to the communications they send back. Does anybody read them? If so, what messages are received? What, they wonder, is the meaning of the questions on the forms? And what are their implications?

Often they believe they have already sufficiently communicated the information they are being asked to provide on yet new forms or in yet other memoranda. Then they ask: did not anyone receive their earlier communications? were they only checked off, filed, and not read? did no one <u>do</u> anything with the information they already provided? Surely, some said, the information which is now being requested is already on the computer downtown. We asked a consultant if that could be so. 'Oh yes,' he said, 'it's on the computer in two or three places. The principals are right. But the system at that level is so overwhelmed with the complexity of information management that it will take (another period of time) before it is possible to obtain that information from the computer rather than asking principals again and again.'*

We would do ethnographies of the communications, direct and mediated, between principals and those who personify the impact of Federal programs and regulations. We would follow a large number of messages of different types, to and from different types of principals in different school districts, back

---

*This quote is based on our memory and was not recorded verbatim.

and forth between the principals and the others. We would document the meanings of the messages to senders and recipients, congruity and incongruity of meaning, open and closed awareness of congruity and incongruity as well as a variety of other contents and qualities of the messages. We would track some communications from Washington to the local school principals and back. We would carefully investigate differences among districts in their communication and administration of Federal programs, policies, and regulations.

Communications seem to be the most serious aspect of the implementation problems the principal talked about experiencing. They are not only mysterious to most principals, they are constantly exasperating to some and periodically very difficult for a large number of others.

We are suggesting two promising directions for future research on the Federal impact on school principals: (1) studies of individual differences between principals in their styles of reaction to the impact and (2) studies of Federal impact related communications between principals and school and governmental officials beyond individual school buildings. In so doing we have suggested qualitative approaches to these future research efforts. In short, we are relating the ways research design affects research outcomes. Most of the research to date, with some important exceptions, has used survey instruments which assess the impact in terms of the variables which one can create a priori. What is needed is more intensive study of dimensions of the Federal impact which have not been amenable to study by structured instruments. The impacts are complex, far reaching, and varied. Qualitative studies* that can take into account contextual, interactive, historical, and psychological aspects of the Federal impact on principals can begin to reveal processes which underlie and explain the survey results and which account for the cries of pain from official representatives of the principals.

---

*This is not to say that qualitative research on such topics as this are without difficulties. We found it difficult to focus research single-mindedly upon the Federal impact on school principals without finding ourselves also studying its impact on school staffs and students. This is because the school principals by their very nature think in terms of their staffs and students all the time. Researchers have to be vigilent and keep bringing principals back to the focal topic: themselves. It is as if the principals' reactions to being asked to tell us about the Federal impact upon themselves are: "Why just me? It's my staff, too, we feel the impact together. Come see the students. They're the ones who need the programs. It affects me because it's necessary for them." Principals in some schools tried to get us to observe classrooms feeling very strongly that the impact was there with the students more than in their offices.

Table 1.

Principals' Styles of Reaction to the Federal Impact by School Type

School Type	Affirmers	Ventilators	Irritated	Unaffected
Elementary/ Junior High	2	4	1	4
High School	4	4	1	0

Table 2.

Principals' Styles of Reaction to the Federal Impact by Location

Location	Affirmers	Ventilators	Irritated	Unaffected
Urban	4	4	1	1
Suburban	0	3	1	2
Rural	2	1	0	1

Table 3.

Principals' Styles of Reaction to the Federal Impact by Background and Gender

Background and Gender	Affirmers	Ventilators	Irritated	Unaffected
Minority Female	1	2	1	0
Non-Minority Female	1	1	0	0
Minority Male	2	0	0	0
Non-Minority Male	2	5	1	4

Principals' Styles of Reaction to the Federal Impact

"an informal tabulation"

STYLES OF REACTION	CONTEXT	% POVERTY*	# FEDERAL PROGS/ POLICIES MENTIONED**	RACE/ ETHNICITY	# YRS AS PRINCIPAL	GENDER	MODE OF ENTRY TO STUDY
Affirmers	urban HS	25%	7	white	2	male	reputation for deseg probs
	urban HS	13%	10	white	20	male	reputation as "star" HS
	urban HS	90%	8	black	19	male	poverty area
	rural HS	24%	11	black	12	male	rural poverty area
	urban ES	89%	5	Hispanic	30	female	referred by former DTA staff
	rural ES	10%	5	white	1	female	rural middle income area
Ventilators	urban HS	15%	5	white	15	female	reputation for benign deseg
	rural HS	10%	2	white	5	male	rural middle income area
	suburban HS	5%	8	white	9	male	referred by school board memb
	suburban JR	3%	17	white	16	male	referred by Ill.Princ.Assn.
	urban ES	60%	7	black	15	female	referred by Chgo.Princ.Assn.
	urban ES	6%	3	black	15	female	reputation as "star" ES
	suburban ES	47%	6	white	8	male	referred by Ill.Princ. Assn.
Irritated	suburban HS	10%	6	white	20	male	referred by Ill.Princ. Assn.
	urban ES	71%	9	black	4	female	referred by former DTA staff
Unaffected	urban ES	33%	3	white	13	male	reputation as "star" magnet
	suburban ES	0	4	white	18	male	referred by Ill.Princ. Assn.
	rural ES	19%	8	white	6	male	rural middle income area

*These are probably not accurate comparative figures. Urban principals tended to know the figures more exactly than did suburban figures and to give them in terms of the percentage below poverty or the percentages receiving free school lunches. For some suburban or rural areas we were sometimes given the percentage with any school lunch subsidy provided.

**This is a rough count of programs and regulations to which they were subject since some principals were more aware of or talkative about them than were others.

Chicago Associates for
Social Research

Poverty and Affluence: Reflections on the Federal Presence in Local Schools

Bruce R. Thomas

Prepared for

The National Institute of Education

October 1981

410 S. Michigan Avenue, Suite 525 Chicago, Illinois 60605-1493 (312) 663-9365

Poverty and Affluence: Reflections on the Federal Presence in Local Schools

Bruce R. Thomas

Introduction

The many and varied forms of the Federal presence in American public schools express two versions of the national interest. One is a concern for the security and well-being of the nation within the global community of nations. The second is a concern for the security and well-being of particular groups of Americans within the national community of Americans. The latter version casts the federal government in the role of an agent of justice, acting on behalf of certain groups to rectify the effects of past injustice and to ameliorate the impact of present inequalities.

The growth of the Federal presence in public education began as an expression of the first version of the national interest--the security and well-being of the United States within the global community. The title of one of the earliest federal pieces of legislation is appropriate: The National Defense Education Act. Since the 1960's, however, the dominant bent of federal educational policy and program has been toward the second form of national interest--the assurance of justice within the American community. The list of groups singled out as objects of Federal attention has steadily grown; it now includes racial minorities such as Blacks and Indians; economic minorities such as the poor; intellectual minorities such as the gifted; status minorities such as the handicapped and women. What is common to an otherwise varied menu of programs and policies is the commitment to an idea of justice.

To a remarkable (and reassuring) degree, the principals we talked to understood and supported this Federal role as agent of justice. They rarely use the terms that we use; but the interviews, taken as a whole, affirm the fact that the principals in our sample not only perceive the underlying and animating purpose of the Federal presence but also agree with it.

We might then say that the Federal government possesses, in addition to other weapons in its arsenal, a stock of moral capital derived from its posture as agent of justice. What happens to this stock of moral capital as school principals grapple with the ordeal of bringing federal intent to life in the realities of daily practice? Put another way: Does the fundamental moral validity of the Federal presence weigh in any significant way against the costs imposed by that same presence? To pursue such a question presents some interesting avenues into the meaning of the Federal government in the lives of local school principals.

To pursue this question and some others, we have chosen three perspectives from which to assess the interviews conducted in our study. The first involves the influence of means on ends: How does the manner of Federal implementation affect the achievement of Federal goals? The second involves establishing connections between the time and place of implementation, on the one hand, and the nature of the objectives sought, on the other. We call this perspective the importance of context. The third perspective focuses on the issue of trust and its role in translating Federal intent into local practice.

The last section draws together the major points of discussion and frames a set of suggestions and recommendations.

The Influence of Means on Ends

Most of the principals with whom we talked understood and agreed with the intent of Federal programs. Their concerns and criticisms often focused on the means of implementation, and, of course, on the costs imposed by those means.

Paperwork is one such cost. The Federal government has imposed paperwork requirements that have cumulatively come to weigh heavily upon school administrators. The nature of that weight and its consequences vary widely. Some principals have been able to shift the paperwork to others and do not feel oppressed; others have accommodated themselves to the requirements, even if it entails the use of private time. Yet others complain vociferously. The paperwork issue is clearly a combination of the real and the symbolic.

It is, at one and the same time, a very real problem and a symbolic problem on which is visited emotions prompted by other forces and trends. It is clear that the nature of the principal's job has changed a great deal over the last two decades. Much of that change has been incremental and originates in social forces and trends that are more felt than understood. In the midst of this process of inexorable change, paperwork is a daily, palpable symbol upon which frustrations can be readily vented. So the issue of paperwork turns out to be rather more elusive than it might initially seem.

A more specific problem, for example, with paperwork concerns the propensity of some Federal programs to spell out in considerable detail just what the letter of the law is to be. Such specificity about the letter of the law invites a response in kind: Adherence to the letter rather than the spirit of the law. We encountered a number of instances where adherence to the letter of the law brought about consequences that were not only absurd but also subversive of the spirit of the law. A case in point was brought out by a suburban junior high school principal who had been required to resegregate black children within his school in order to meet compensatory education requirements, once they had been brought there as part of a system-wide desegregation plan.

This same example brings to the surface another point about the means of implementation, namely, the program mentality that is induced among local school officials. Loosely defined, the program mentality is one in which no initiative or responsibility is undertaken unless it is officially labeled or mandated as a program and given special financial support. The assumptions implicit in the program mentality are, when made explicit, a rather odd set. One such assumption is that problems must be directly attacked; the universe created by the program mentality is not hospitable to subtlety, indirection and patience. A second assumption is that the results of the people-changing process (which is what most Federal programs are about, one way or another; they seek to change teachers and students) can be brought in quickly, assessed accurately and rendered in quantitative proxies. A third is that the bounded universe created by a program is functionally equivalent to the full reality of the problem addressed.

These assumptions prove out to be a fleet of leaky vessels that begin taking on water minutes after leaving port. So the undertakings predicated upon these assumptions carry obvious consequences for initiative, creativity and ingenuity at the local level. At the Federal level, such assumptions induce a state of mind in which the administrators of one Federal program tend to be blinded to the operations and effects of other Federal programs. Such blindness leads in turn to the overlooking of what might be called inter-program synergy: The interaction of one Federal program with another. In the case cited earlier, involving suburban junior high school principal's struggles with integration, one federal mandate meshed with another to produce an absurd result: black children brought to a formerly all-white school in the name of integration were, once in the new school, resegregated. PL 94-142 has presented similar problems; a number of principals expressed concern about it's procedural requirements becoming so burdensome that they had the effect of slighting the entitlement (to time and attention) of other groups (some of whom are themselves the objects of Federal programs). One junior high school principal in a Chicago suburb estimated that he spent close to 20% of his time on 94-142 matters and felt that such a purchase of his time made it impossible for him to attend to the interest of gifted children.

Fashioning a definitive set of remarks on the influence of means on ends cannot, in the context of this brief paper, proceed much farther than a summary of the points already made. One point concerns the superficial legalism of many Federal program implementation processes; such a legalism invites adherance to the letter rather than the spirit of the law. A second point involves the implicit assumptions (and therefore inadvertent and unexpected consequences) of the program mentality created by the Federal approach to implementation. Some problems are best approached indirectly; Federal implementation for the most part requires a directness of approach that is in certain contexts either not feasible or positively counterproductive. One junior high school principle spoke angrily to this point:

> Between myself and my school superintendent, we can usually figure out a way to get something done. He's savvy about local politics and state politics. But we sometimes get into real battles with Federal people because all they can see is a procedure and a timetable and they wonder why in hell we can't just follow that procedure and that timetable. Well, the answer is, if you're interested in achieving the goal--say, integration--then sometimes you gotta edge into it and back into it and do one thing in the name of another and so on.

Both these points arise from problems fundamental to the program mentality and those problems create pressures, frustrations and other problems for school principals--and thus also creat a context in which the issue of paperwork becomes the symbolic villain upon which angers and frustrations can be readily visited.

The Importance of Context

Where and when a Federal program is established works a significant influence on the nature of its impact on schools and school principals and on the likelihood of achieving successful results. Context, in short, is often crucial.

The nature of context can range from the broadly national to the parochially local. An example of the former is the state of the national economy. That economy was healthy and producing growth dividends when ESEA was enacted in the mid-1960's; the situation was altogether different when 94-142 came to the point of implementation in the late 1970's. The alteration in context clearly shows up in the reactions that each engendered. ESEA was itself amply funded and the costs that it unexpectedly imposed on schools could usually be absorbed. P.L. 94-142 was more leanly funded and the costs that it imposed have been levied upon school systems that were already experiencing severe cost problems. ESEA arrived upon a nation still convinced of the infinitude of abundance; 94-142 arrived amidst growing appreciation of the facts of scarcity.

This difference in context works some clear consequences upon the moral authority of the Federal government. To rectify injustices visited upon one

group without impairing the entitlements of other groups is one matter; to subtract from one group in order to give to another is an altogether different matter. The idea of justice for which the Federal government acts in 94-142 is a painful one. What is therefore remarkable--and reassuring--is the fact, not that 94-142 has prompted a great deal of complaining, but that it has engendered remarkably little complaining, given the change in context. P.L. 94-142 poses a singularly difficult challenge to a nation's commitment to justice, because it calls for justice at a time when justice costs a great deal more than it did before.

A quite different aspect of the influence of context upon implementation of Federal programs arises from an examination of Federal food programs. We were provided in the course of our interviews with a study in contrasts in school lunch program administration. One case was an urban and largely black high school; the other was a rural and virtually all-white elementary school. For the principal of the urban high school, the school lunch program was an affront; it exacted unexpected costs in supervision requirements and was seen to contribute to an ethic of dependency. For the principal of the rural elementary school, the school lunch program afforded a splendid opportunity for the community to participate in and contribute to the life of the school. For one principal, the school lunch program was a requirement to be met; for the other, it was an opportunity to be exploited. The influence in each case of the larger context was powerful, if difficult to assess precisely.

These two examples of the influence of context--one broadly national, the other specifically local--raise questions. Should the Federal government's approach to implementation build on uniformity of approach or should it strive toward a flexibility that fits more realistically with the variety with which it must deal? Is it possible to shape implementation policy with an eye toward such powerful factors as the state of the economy and its impact on both institutions and individuals?

The Issue of Trust

As elusively unquantifiable as it is, the issue of trust entails cost

consequences in the execution of Federal educational policy. And it entails other consequences as well, such as the depletion of self-confidence, sense of obligation, initiative and honesty.

The issue of trust forces itself to the surface because the Federal government often presents itself as a profoundly distrustful entity. The assumption implicit in much of regulatory procedure and program administration is that institutional actors at the state and local levels are prepared and disposed to fiddle the Feds whenever possible.

We are compelled to question the utility of this assumption by the evidence uncovered in our interviews. Out of that evidence, three points emerge. First, school principals on the whole do make their own separate peace with underlying program objectives and that peace is generally an honorable one. Second, the procedures and requirements born of distrust very often do not work to assure the desired outcomes. And, third, the distrust on the Federal side helps to create a culture of distrust that ultimately entails a considerable waste of human energy as well as material resources.

In short, distrust exacts a very high cost. Because local officials are not trusted to understand and move to fulfill the spirit of the law, mountains of forms must be filled out; these forms must be duplicated, dispatched and disposed of; officials at various levels must be employed to monitor and inspect. The sum cost of distrust is awesome.

It strikes us, therefore, as very peculiar that so little attention has been paid to alternative approaches to implementation that build upon a different set of assumptions about individual behavior within local school systems. The existing assumptions clearly do not work very well. They call forth the behavior that frustrates achievement of the goals desired; rote compliance that diminishes the possibility of local competence will elicit rote compliance and undermine local competence. Sublime indifference to the complex calculus of interests within which local school officials must negotiate a careful course can erode the moral authority underwriting Federal policy and program and narrow the close margins within which local school officials exercise discretion.

Why then not consider approaches to implementation that involve different attitudes about the trustworthiness and competence of local officials? We will pursue this question in the final and concluding section.

Conclusions

Acting to fulfill the national interest in an ideal of justice is an honorable task that is also vexingly difficult. We are struck, at the end of our short study, by the contrast between the moral affluence of Federal goals and the imaginative poverty of Federal means.

To appreciate fully this contrast between affluence of purpose and poverty of means, we need to look at the implementation of Federal educational policy as an unstable combination of the static and the dynamic.

What is dynamic about the implementation of Federal programs is the contexts in which it is attempted. The state of the economy is one particularly powerful element in the dynamics of context. The interactions of Federal educational programs and policies among themselves contribute to the dynamics of context, as does the interaction of Federal educational programs with other Federal programs and policies. Thus, for example, while educational policy attempts to reduce the inequalities of American life and to broaden the opportunities for the excluded, Federal economic policies may be closing off opportunities and widening inequalities. The melody that the Federal government plays upon the national piano is an odd cacophony of dissonance and contradiction.

Against this dynamic quality of the environment within which Federal education policy is implemented is posed a strangely static approach to implementation. The Federal government when it sets about the process of implementing a program settles back to a standard, well-rehearsed routine. The appropriate agency draws up proposed rules and publishes them; the sundry interests involved comment upon the rules; revisions are usually then made and the final rules then published. The rules create a particular kind of universe predicated upon a set of implicit assumptions about individuals, about institutions and about the interactions between the two.

Viewed anthropologically, this ritual is one whose authority can now rest only upon sheer age. It is clearly time to consider alternative assumptions to guide implementation and to test such assumptions, if only because the costs, human and financial entailed in the present system are far too high.

It might well be possible to reckon up some dollar estimation of the costs of present practice. But what is more serious are the less tangible costs such as the depletion of confidence and competence among local school officials and parents, the misallocation of scarce resources and, above all, the erosion of the moral authority of the Federal government as an agent of justice.

This last cost, the erosion of the Federal moral authority, occurs for a number of reasons, most of them connected to the means of implementing Federal program and policy. Implementation often reduces the grandeur of the moral position to a set of petty and trivial procedures. In so doing, the chosen means of implementation forecloses the possibility of local officials finding their own ways to get a purchase on the moral enterprise--and so forecloses a fundamental mission of life itself, which is to work one's way through to a reconciliation of durable moral imperatives with the obstacles and barriers of everday life.

Is it possible for the Federal government to be both a hard-nosed agent of justice and an imaginative guide to the paths of justice? We clearly think so--and think that the attempts must be made. Some profound dangers will attend such attempts; the most important of those dangers is the possibility that present flaws and failures in implementation will be used as an excuse to absolve the Federal government from its role as agent of justice. That is the danger to which those who might alter present schemes of implementation must be constantly alert.

How might such alterations in implementation practice be initiated? We have some beginning suggestions.

The first is quite simple: To compile an overview and summary of Federal educational policy and programs that explains the underlying intent of the Federal role. Such an overview can impart a coherence--which is

partly and importantly historical--to what now appears to be a helter-skelter hodgepodge of regulation, policy and program. The coherence rests upon the moral posture of the Federal government as an agent of justice.

A second step is to initiate a series of demonstration projects in which local schools are offered several alternative ways to implement Federal program and policy or are given the discretion to devise their own approaches to implementation. Demonstration programs as a rule have been reserved to the program realm. Our research suggests that demonstrations may well be as useful in the realm of implementation as in the realm of program.

Chicago Associates for
Social Research

The Federal Impact Upon School Principals

Annotated Bibliography

Prepared for

The National Institute of Education

October 1981

410 S. Michigan Avenue, Suite 525 Chicago, Illinois 60605-1493 (312) 663-9365

This annotated bibliography was prepared as part of an exploratory study commissioned by the National Institute of Education for the following purposes:

> To assist in planning further research in this area...To review what has already been written on the subject, to carry out initial interviews and observations with principals in a range of schools, to consult with knowledgeable researchers, all for the purpose of making NIE aware of gaps in current knowledge and how they might best be filled through further research (NIE RFQ July 1980, p.4).

This bibliography was prepared by Judith Markowitz, Marilyn S. Notkin, Judith Pollock, and Hannah Meara.

Literature on the following seven topics has been annotated:

1. Principals' Response to Federal Mandates and Regulations;
2. Advice to Principals on Implementation of Federal Programs, Mandates and Regulations;
3. Legal Advice to Principals Regarding Federal Programs, Policies, and Regulations;
4. Advice About the Legal Status of Principals;
5. The Principal's Role;
6. Job Satisfaction and Personal Characteristics of Principals;
7. Comments on Policy.

Literature annotated under the first heading are the primary references in this area of concern. Literature in the next three sections on advice to principals is informative about issues of concern to the Federal impact all of which have not yet become the subjects of research. Literature on the principal's role, on job satisfaction and personal characteristics of principals, and on policy inform us about the context within which the Federal impact is experienced.

Bibliography

Studies Reporting on Principals Response to Federal Mandates and Regulations

Abramowitz, S. and Tenebaum, E. High School '77: A Survey of Public Secondary School Principals. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1978.

Based on interview responses from 1,448 high school principals the authors describe the structure of American high schools. They examine the comprehensiveness of the academic programs, the bureaucratic structure of the schools and the problems facing high schools. They found that, according to the principals, most schools have comprehensive programs allowing for individual instruction. The principals viewed themselves as managers of a "loosely coupled" organization rather than a bureaucracy. Few felt that Federal requirements of desegregation etc. were objectionable but many objected to the paperwork involved in Federal programs.

The authors suggest that the popular belief about high schools are incorrect. They propose several strategies for helping alleviate problems in high schools.

Becker, Gerald, et al. Issues and Problems in Elementary School Administration. Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University, Center for Educational Research and Service, February 1970.

This is a report of the findings of a national study to determine the problems of elementary school principals. The study employed a questionnaire and an interview guide sent to principals in all 50 states. Areas covered include: the school and society; public leadership; organizational texture; and finances and facilities. With regard to integration, principals felt they were being replaced as the educational leaders of their schools. They report that Federal programs have increased the principals' record-keeping responsibilities. The article also deals with training programs for principals, and Federally funded programs.

Berman, Paul, Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin, et al. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change Volume VII Factors Affecting Implementation and Continuation. R-1589/7-HEW Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corp., April 1977.

This document presents results of a survey of 100 Title IV projects one to two years after the end of Federal Funding, (100 superintendents, 171 principals, 1072 teachers) and shows the effects of principals on Federal programs.

Principals are seen as critical to the quality of school life as well as to project outcomes. Their support is crucial for the implementation and continuation of projects. They are responsible for establishing the school's educational policy and philosophy; they provide orientation to teachers about projects, explain them to parents, coordinate classroom changes (routines, use of volunteers etc.) run interference with disapproving non-project teachers or parents.

The management styles of principals are explored: Peer, Moral Supporter, Instructional Leader and Administrator. It is suggested that participation in educational programs of this type can enhance the overall effectiveness of principals as school managers.

Glasman, N.S. The Effects of Governmental Evaluation Mandates. Administrator's Notebook, 1978-1980, 27 (2).

Based on a study utilizing open-ended interviews with principals, teachers and parents from school districts in Southern California, this article examines how the traditional role of school administrators as evaluators has shifted with the emergence of governmental mandates. School principals said they considered that their responsibility to gather information has increased while their authority to act on the information has decreased. The decrease in authority and increase in bureaucratic rules have produced an increased reliance on "informal" rewards to subordinates. Other effects on administrators are apparent indecisiveness and an increased collegiality with lay officials in the district.

Hill, Paul, Joanne Wuchitech, Richard Williams. The Effects of Federal Education Programs on School Principals. N. 1467-HEW. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corp., February 1980.

This paper presents the results of an exploratory study based on telephone interviews with 55 principals in six states representing national regions, school districts of diverse sizes and schools of varying size and grade levels. Principals report that over the past five years their role has changed and now entails more demanding, complex work; more people to deal with (specialists, aides, students, local district administrators, Federal and State officials assigned to projects, parent advisory councils); instructional demands; non-instructional demands; and non-instructional programs such as health, discipline and nutrition all of which are exacerbated by due-process rights. Many report less time for supervising teachers and dealing with students. Also reported: busier days, more night work, less discretionary time, more scrutiny and criticism and less autonomy than five years ago, although not all changes are attributed to the Federal programs. Many feel that low-income areas are most affected by multiple Federal programs due to the requirement for separate parent groups, administrative burdens and separate financial reports.

Jackson, Michael and Barbara Battiste. Illinois Principals' Perceptions of Title IX. Illinois Principal, March 1980.

The article summarizes the results of a 23 question survey administered to 820 high school principals. Five hundred and thirteen responses were received (62% of Illinois principals). They reported that the major effects of Title IX were: increased expenditures and use of school facilities primarily because of expanded girls' athletic programs; a difference in the degree of participation of girls in athletic programs appeared to be related to the size of the school, the larger schools having more participation; there were varying degrees of increase in faculty responsibility for athletic programs; attitudes toward Title IX were in part related to the size of the school, smaller schools tended to have a less favorable attitude toward change. Schools with 1500 or more reported favorable attitudes.

National Association of Elementary School Principals. Survey Report. Arlington, Virginia, May 1980.

This document reports on a survey of the impact of multiple State and Federal programs. Problems identified were: 1) Regulations and objectives of the various programs are inconsistent and should be consolidated. 2) They cause too much paperwork. 3) There is too much parent involvement.

Schoeny, Donna Hager and Robert Ho. The Role of the Principal in Federal Programs. Report for National Institute of Education, 1980.

The paper focuses on a sample of National Institute of Education sponsored research relating to the principal's role in Federal programs and discusses the professional training of principals for the role of leader and change agent. The authors maintain that the principal's job involves the following: 1) securing support for the school, 2) governing the school, 3) developing curriculum and staff, 4) administering the school, 5) mediating human relations in the school. They further state that the success of new programs are related to school context variables and that principals need leadership skills for innovative organization and management of programs and the complex interrelationships they cause.

Advice to Principals on Implementation of Federal Programs, Mandates and Regulations

Allen, J.E., Jr. The Role of the Elementary School Principal in Achieving the Right to Read Goal. Address before the Convention of the National Association of Elementary School Principals, Philadelphia, April 19, 1970.

In this address Mr. Allen encourages principals to take an active role in reading programs. He describes a plan which includes Federal funding for the development of what he calls "right to read programs."

Barbarovi, D.R. and others. The Handicapped Children Act--P.S. 94-142: Implications for Principals. Paper presented at the National Association of Secondary School Principals Annual Convention, New Orleans, Louisiana, January 1977.

This paper describes three areas of school environment which may be reshaped by P.L. 94-142: A shift of emphasis from "preparing children to be societal members as adults" to education of the individual; changes in the relationships among educational professionals and between parents and educations favoring a team approach; and changes in decision making. School administrators must oversee these changes.

Callahan, D.W. Procedural Due Process Required for Exceptional Children. Georgia Association of Middle School Principals Journal, 1977, 1 (2), 37-42.

This article describes various court cases involving exceptional children and provides procedures for parental complaint. Although no direct mention of principals is made, their involvement is implicit.

Georgia Department of Education, Office of Instructional Services. Parent Advisory Council Information Handbook for Title I in Georgia. Atlanta, Georgia, 1977.

This handbook is a guide for parents and school personnel in establishing and determining the functions of Title I, ESEA parent advisory councils. It is predicated on the fact that parent involvement has been strongly advocated by both State and Federal officials. Areas covered include the role of the principal as the educational leader of the school in establishing and working continuously with the parent advisory council, as well as information about how to establish a council, funding sources, handling grievances and evaluating parent councils.

Keller, E. Principal Issues in P.L. 94-142. The National Elementary Principal, 1977, 56 (4), 80-82.

This article discusses the legislation regarding education of handicapped children. The topics covered include: 1) the availability and cost of education; 2) physical education; 3) individualized programs; 4) parental rights; 5) help for the principal in understanding and interpreting the law. Help to principals refers to inservice training of educational personnel, detailed procedures to insure that all personnel are adequately trained to carry out the purposes of the Act, and dissemination of materials.

National Association of Elementary School Principals. The Busing Controversy. NAESP School Leadership Digest Second Series, Number 6. ERIC/CEM Research Analysis Series, Number 21. Washington, D.C., 1976.

This paper discusses the changing behavior of each branch of the Federal government regarding busing. It states that as a result local officials are confused about how to proceed.

Nostrand, P.R. The High School Principal's Role with Respect to the Present Marihuana Problem. University of Virginia, School of Education, 1973 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 078 516).

This paper outlines measures for dealing with and prevention of marihuana use among high school students. Descriptions of Federal legislation regarding marihuana use are included in the article.

Saif, P.S. A Handbook for the Evaluation of Teachers and Principals. Bloomfield, Connecticut: Capital Region Education Council, September 1976.

This Handbook provides information about the roles of teachers and principals and systems for evaluating both. It mentions that the principal manages Federal monies and acts as a communication link between the school and the government as well as between the school and parents.

Swartz, Stanley. A Recommendation for Competency Testing and the Handicapped. Illinois Principal, September 1979.

Reviews major provisions of P.L. 94-142, The Individualized Educational Program (IEP), and the components of minimal competency testing.

Widmer, Henry N. Critical Tasks for the Principal in Implementing the Least Restrictive Environment Mandate of P.L. 94-142. Illinois Principal, March 1979.

The author states that the principal should view special education as an integral and not supplementary part of the total school program. The principal, as instructional leader, determines the outlook of the staff and is the key person in developing a philosophical tolerance among the participants in a mainstreaming scheme. Factors to be weighed in executing P.L. 94-142 are: legal concerns, sufficient funding, community support, adequate staff and facilitation of faculty growth. Due to 94-142 the principal is propelled into an active posture rather than reacting to problems as has been traditional.

Legal Advice to Principals Regarding Federal Programs, Policies, and Regulations

Ackerly, R.L. and Gluckman, I.B. The Reasonable Exercise of Authority, II. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1976.

This document provides principals and other administrators with basic and general legal principles of due process and suggests approaches to the use of authority. Topics covered include: 1) due process; 2) freedom of expression; 3) civil rights; 4) codes of behavior; 5) discipline; and 6) student records.

Goldsmith, A.H. Discipline, Discrimination, Disproportionality and Discretion: A Legal Memorandum. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, November 1979.

The practice of leaving discipline to the discretion of the administrator allows individualized treatment, but invites discrimination. This article describes current laws which apply to discipline and explains how to comply.

McCrosky, Cherie LeLeure and Grace Duff. Legal Aspects of Sex Discrimination in Education. Illinois Principal. May 1975.

The authors summarize legislation regarding sex discrimination and describe cases of sex discrimination in education. Highlights major controversies surrounding their enactments.

Nolte, M. and Chester, E. School Communications: Duties and Dangers: A Legal Memorandum. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, April 1974.

This memorandum discusses legal risks involved in oral and written communications. The focus is on Federal court cases of libel and stresses the increasing need for principals to monitor what they write and say.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. A Legal Memorandum. Reston, Virginia, April 1976.

This memorandum discusses current regulations regarding bilingual education and indicates that the courts have not yet made clear the applicability of this legislation.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. Concerning the Confidentiality of Pupil School Records. Reston, Virginia, September 1976.

This memorandum discusses the major legal issues related to the confidentiality of students' school records stressing in particular the requirements of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act. The principal is required to ensure compliance with the FERPA and State laws regarding the proper release of documents. Principals and other administrators are admonished to exercise great care both as to what is placed in student's record and to whom the material is communicated.

Advice About the Legal Status of Principals

King, R.A. Litigation, Legislation and the Principal. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 8-12, 1979.

A study of recent litigation and legislation indicates that the legal status of principals has changed in the past five years. Legislatures and legal decisions have recognized the unique legal status of principals and have stipulated their duties and responsibilities which include supervising facilities and personnel and assuming leadership in all phases of educational programs. Other mandates have specified due process rights of students and teachers, collective bargaining rights and certification requirements. Future litigation and legislation, the author contends, will continue to alter the role of the principal.

McDonnell, L. and Pascal, A. Organized Teachers in American Schools. (R.2407-NIE). Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, February 1979.

This document describes the legal status of teachers' unions. The school principal is mentioned with regard to collective bargaining.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. Concerning Statutory Protection for Principals. Reston, Virginia, November 1976.

This paper discusses State laws regarding the principalship. Only eight States have codes which specifically describe the principal's role and identity. Other States have legislation which refers to the authority and responsibility of the principal.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. The Legal Status of the Principal: A Legal Memorandum. Washington, D.C., September 1973.

This Memorandum examines existing State laws regarding school principalship. In 15 states principals have the basic elements of legal status and in 6 others they have specific duties and responsibilities.

Studies of the Principal's Role

Barraclough, T. The Role of the Elementary School Principal. Educational Management Review Series Number 19. Eugene, Oregon: Oregon University, July 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 077 127).

This document contains a review of articles dealing with the role of elementary school principals and job perceptions of principals.

Fishburn, W. Differences in Tasks of Elementary Principals in Rural and Urban Areas. Las Cruces, New Mexico: Mesilla Park Elemtary School, May 1, 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 153 753).

This paper reports on the data obtained from a questionnaire sent to 16 rural and 16 urban elementary school principals. Questions dealt with professional duties and interaction with teachers and other personnel.

Jarvis, O.T., Parker, C.A. and Moore, A.A., Jr. A Status Survey of the Elementary School Principalship in Georgia, 1969. Athens, Georgia: The Georgia Department of Elementary School Principals and the Bureau of Educational Studies and Field Services, College of Education, University of Georgia, 1970.

This paper describes the role of the elementary school principal in Georgia. Areas covered include: 1) personal traits; 2) professional preparation; 3) job satisfaction and working conditions; 4) administrative and supervisory practices; and 5) relations with the community and professional organizations.

Lortie, Dan C. Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

In reporting on this study the author depicts principals as people who must manage complex enterprises without extensive powers. As the head of the school they make many small decisions affecting the social life within the school, but changes in their traditional role have made them people whose responsibilities outrun their authority.

Melton, G.E. and others. The Principalship: Job Specifications and Salary Considerations for the 70's. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1970.

This paper presents an updated job description of the secondary school principalship as well as an approach to evaluation of job performance

and a statement concerning salaries for principals. In assessing the job of principals, the authors describe the principal's duties as educational leader, administrator, communicator to the outside, mediator, and professional.

Reed, R.J. School Principals: Leaders or Managers? July 16, 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 145 158).

This questionnaire study examines how principals view their role. It covers the following areas: 1) the characteristics of principals and their schools; 2) the attitudes of principals regarding career preparation programs; 3) job satisfaction; 4) duties and responsibilities; and 5) relations with teachers, parents and other individuals. The findings suggest that the principals view their role as primarily that of an educational leader rather than a manager.

Rock, D.A. and Hemphill, J.K. Report of the Junior High School Principalship, Volume II. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1966.

This report presents the data gathered from a survey of 4,500 junior high school principals concerning: 1) personal and professional preparation; 2) duties, activities and compensation of principals; 3) principals' attitudes on current educational issues. Interview questions include principals' attitudes towards forced integration and the Supreme Court decision on prayers in the schools.

Thomas, M.A. A Study of Alternatives in American Education, Volume II: The Role of the Principal (R.217/2-NIE). Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, April 1978.

This paper describes the role of the principal in alternative schools.

Wenrich, R.C. and Shaffer, E.W. High School Principals' Perceptions of the Roles and Responsibilities of Persons Who Would be Charged with the Responsibility for Leadership in the Development of Occupationally Oriented Programs in High Schools. Lansing, Michigan: Office of Research Administration, State Board of Control for Vocational Education, September 1965.

Principals in 106 large high schools were interviewed about how they would use an assistant who would be in charge of developing occupationally oriented programs.

West, E.L., Jr. The Co-Principalship: Administrative Realism. The High School Journal, 1978, 61 (5), 241-246.

This article discusses the demands placed upon secondary school principals which make the concept of co-principalship viable. One principal becomes the principal for instruction and the other becomes principal of administration. Their duties and responsibilities are described.

Studies of Job Satisfaction and Personal Characteristics of Principals

Gross, Neal and others. The Level of Occupational Aspiration of Men School Principals. National Principalship Study Series, Monograph 6. Final Report. Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Graduate School of Education, August 1967.

Based on a statistical analysis of questionnaires administered to 382 male principals nationally, this study examined socio-economic status, social mobility, organizational climate, role perception, self evaluation, career opportunities and job satisfaction.

Gross, Neal, David A. Napior. The Job and Career Satisfaction of Men School Principals. National Principalship Study Series, Monograph 5. Final Report. Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Graduate School of Education, June 1967.

Utilizing factor analysis of questionnaires administered to 382 male principals, this study focused on their career choices, individual characteristics, interpersonal relationships, psychological needs, job satisfaction and rewards within the framework of role theory.

Feilter, Fred C. A Study of Principal Leader Behavior and Contrasting Organizational Environments. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois, April 3-7, 1972.

Utilizing various measurement instruments and typologies, this paper reported on a study which investigated the organizational climate, democratic values, leadership styles, teacher/administrator relations and job satisfaction of elementary school principals.

Johnson, Dale A., Donald J. Weiss. Middle Management Decision-Making and Job Satisfaction: The Relationship Between Participation in Decision Making, Personality Characteristics, and Job Satisfaction of Building Principals. Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities Metropolitan ARea, Inc.: Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1971.

This paper reports on research on principals of elementary and secondary schools studing job satisfaction, teacher/administrator relationships, theories of personalities, and styles of decision-making including collective negotiation.

Miskel, Cecil. Public School Principals' Leader Style, Organizational Situation, and Effectiveness. Kansas University, Lawrence, Kansas, 1974.

This study of the effectiveness of public school principals, their organizational settings and individual characteristics examined job satisfaction, leadership styles as well as organizational climates and performance factors.

Paddock, Susan C. Careers in Educational Administration: Are Women the Exception? Oregon University, Eugene, Oregon: Center for Educational Policy and Management, January 1978.

Based on an occupational survey of school principals, this paper presents a comparative analysis dealing with such subjects as: race, educational attainment, careers and career ladders, the characteristics of administrators, marital status, role conflict, attitudes toward work, sex differences in occupational achievement and sex discrimination.

Paddock, Susan C. Male and Female High School Principals: A Comparative Study. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 9, 1979.

This study employed questionnaires to assess differences between female and male high school principals. Areas covered include background, job satisfaction, career aspirations and minority group membership.

Poppenhaven, B.W. A Comparison of Elementary School Principals to Junior/Middle and Senior High Principals on Perceived Job Related Tensions, Participation in Decision Making, Job Involvement and Job Satisfaction. College of St. Thomas, 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 144 226).

This study was concerned with the possibility of differences in job satisfaction between junior/middle school principals and high school principals. The only area of difference found was that of the degree of job interference in family life which was greater for high school principals.

Comments on Policy

Elmore, Richard F. Complexity and Control: What Legislators and Administrators can do About Implementing Public Policy. Report for National Institute for Education, August 1980 (NIE P 77-0070).

The author maintains that influence can come only if policymakers recognize that the most important part of implementation takes place at the bottom of the system and not at the top. The more control exerted at the top, the less likely the desired results at the bottom, where the client is. If more hierarchical control is exerted, agencies are more likely to get compliance, but it will come at the cost of greater complexity. A programmatic approach relies on delegated control and an emphasis on raising the delivery capacity at the expense of compliance. The first approach sees local variability as a threat to uniform program guidelines; the latter capitalizes on the inventiveness of the people who are actually delivering the service and treats diversity as the best way to improve local programs.

Hargrove, Erwin C., Scarlett G. Graham, Leslie E. Ward, Virginia Abernethy, Joseph Cunningham and William K. Vaughn. School Systems and Regulatory Mandates: A Case Study of the Implementation of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. Institute for Public Policy Studies, Vanderbilt University, August 1980.

In this case study the authors state that the law is implemented in phases. Phase I involves sweeping regulatory strategies in the beginning to secure gross compliance with rules and lasts a long time. Gradually a stable Federal regulatory pattern emerges in which formal rules are supplemented by informal norms. Eventually a second and more difficult stage of implementation begins which involves identifying effective strategies for achieving intended goals. In this phase Federal and State strategies should seek to foster local institutional capacities to cope with difficult delivery issues and strengthen them. Federal officials are more comfortable with regulations and compliance monitoring requiring uniformity across jurisdictions. Uniform rules from above may engender pro forma complaince in which people go through the motions with fear that invention will be taken as failure to comply. The authors feel it is important for all concerned to be watching, learning and revising regulatory strategies. If the first stage of implementation is a top down strategy in which rules are imposed on localities, the second stage is a bottom up strategy in which rules are revised to foster elements of strength in local settings.

Wise, A. Legislated Learning: The Bureaucratization of the American Classroom. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1979.

This book examines the overall results of educational policies and decisions emanating from all three branches of the Federal government. After examining the policies, Wise describes their effects in terms of increasing bureaucratization of schools. He concludes that independent private education and local control of public education are threatened. Local administrators and teachers will have an increasing number of constraints on their ability to establish educational policy. Wise contends this will ultimately harm our society.